



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CLC
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,642	04/09/2004	Balasubramanian Gopalan	04654/1200494-US1	9007
7278	7590	12/13/2005	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P. O. BOX 5257 NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257				CHU, YONG LIANG
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1626		

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/821,642	GOPALAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yong Chu	1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-91 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 81-91 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-19 and 21-80 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/20/2004</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-91 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant's Information Disclosure Statements, filed on 20 August 2004, have been considered. Please refer to Applicant's copies of the PTO-1449 submitted herewith.

Priority

This application claims the benefit of India Provisional Patent Application 363/MUM/2003, filed on 11 April 2003 and U.S. Provisional Patent Application 60/519,967 filed on 13 November 2003.

Election/Restrictions

The Markush group set forth in the claims includes both independent and distinct inventions, and patentable distinct compounds (or species) within each invention. However, this application discloses and claims a plurality of patentable distinct inventions far too numerous to list individually. Moreover, each of these inventions contains a plurality of patentable distinct compounds, also far too numerous to list individually. ***For these reasons provided below, restriction to one of the following Groups is required under 35 U.S.C. 121,*** wherein a group is a set of patentable distinct inventions of a broad statutory category (e.g. compounds, methods of use, methods of making, etc.):

- I. Claims 1-80 are drawn to products of the formula (I), classified in various subclasses of classes 514,544, 546,548 and 549.
- II. Claim 81 is drawn to a method of preparation of compounds with Formula (I), classified in various subclasses of classes 514,544, 546,548 and 549.
- III. Claim 82 is drawn to a method of preparation of compounds with Formula (I), classified in various subclasses of classes 514,544, 546,548 and 549.
- IV. Claim 83 is drawn to a method of preparation of compounds with Formula (I), classified in various subclasses of classes 514,544, 546,548 and 549.
- V. Claims 84-91 are drawn to a method of treating various diseases, classified in various subclasses of class 514.

In accordance with the decisions in *In re Harnisch*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984), restriction of a Markush group is proper where the compounds within the group either (1) do not share a common utility, or (2) do not share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility. In addition, a Markush group may encompass a plurality of independent and distinct inventions where two or more members are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claim with respect to one of the members would not render the other member(s) obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Where an election of any one of Group I is made, an election of a single compound is further required including an exact definition of each substitution on the base molecule (Formula (I)), wherein a single member at each substituent group or moiety is selected. For example, if a base molecule has a substituent group R1, wherein R1 is recited to be any one of H, OH, COOH, aryl, alkoxy, halogen, amino, etc., then applicant must select a single substitute R1, for example OH or aryl and each subsequent variable position. In the instant case, upon election of a single compound, the Office will review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the independent invention encompassing the elected compound (compounds which are so similar thereto as to be within the same inventive concept and reduction to practice). The scope of an independent invention will encompass all compounds within the scope of the claim, which fall into the same class and subclass as the elected compound, but may also include additional compounds, which fall in related subclasses. Examination will then proceed on the elected compound AND the entire scope of the invention encompassing the elected compound as defined by common classification. A clear statement of the examined invention, defined by those class(es) and subclass(es) will be set forth in the first action on the merits. Note that the restriction requirement will not be made final until such time as applicant is informed of the full scope of compounds along with (if appropriate) the process of using or making said compound under examination. This will be set forth by reference to specific class(es) and subclass(es) examined. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the compound are not patentably distinct, applicant

should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the compound to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other.

All compounds falling outside the class(es) and subclass(es) of the selected compound and any other subclass encompassed by the election above will be directed to nonelected subject matter and will be withdrawn from consideration under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 C.F.R. 1.142(b). Applicant may reserve the right to file divisional applications on the remaining subject matter. (The provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 applies with regard to double patenting covering divisional applications.)

Where an election of Group V is made, an election of one of the following methods of use is required:

- A. Method of treating asthma
- B. Method of treating Crohns disease
- C. Method of treating amnesia
- E. Method of treating Alzheimers disease
- F. Method of treating insulin resistant diabetes
- G. Etc...

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a nonelected invention, the inventions must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one

claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(i).

If desired upon election of a single compound, applicants can review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the invention and can *set forth* a group of compounds, which are so similar within the same inventive concept and reduction to practice. Markush claims must be provided with support in the disclosure for each member of the Markush group. See MPEP 608.01(p). Applicant should exercise caution in making a selection of a single member for each constituent group on the base molecule to be consistent with the written description.

Rationale Establishing Patentable Distinctiveness Within Each Group

Each Group listed above is directed to or involves the use of compounds which are recognized in the art as being distinct from one another because of their diverse chemical structure, their different chemical properties, modes of action, different effects and reactive conditions (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). Additionally, the level of skill in the art is not such that one invention would be obvious over the other invention (Group), i.e. they are patentable over each other. Chemical structures, which are similar, are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not irrebuttable, but may be overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the

structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holding of Application of Papesch, 50 CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and In re Lalu, 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where the structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure.

The above groups represent general areas wherein the inventions are independent and distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II-IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed could be made in a materially different process as demonstrated throughout the specification and in claims 81-83. Also, each process can be used to make materially different products.

Inventions I and V are related as product and process of using. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed could be used in a materially different

process of using that product as demonstrated throughout the specification and in claims 84-91 which are directed to several different methods of using the product. For example treating various diseases, such as asthma, Crohns disease, amnesia, Alzheimers disease or insulin resistant diabetes. Also, each disease can be treated with materially different products.

Inventions II-IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the process for making products is unrelated with the process of treating the disease.

In addition, because of the plethora of classes and subclasses in each of the Groups, a serious burden is imposed on the examiner to perform a complete search of the defined areas. Therefore, because of the reasons given above, the restriction set forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

Advisory of Rejoinder

The following is a recitation of M.P.E.P. 821.04, Rejoinder:

Where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, applicant may be called upon under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect claims to either the product or process. See MPEP § 806.05(f) and § 806.05(h). The claims to the nonelected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration under 37 CFR 1.142. See MPEP § 809.02(c) and § 821 through § 821.03. However, if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Where the application as originally filed discloses the product and the process for making and/or using the product, and only claims directed to the product are presented for examination, when a product claim is found allowable, applicant may present claims directed to the process of making and/or using the patentable product by way of amendment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121. In view of the rejoinder procedure, and in order to expedite prosecution, applicants are encouraged to present such process claims,

Art Unit: 1626

preferably as dependent claims, in the application at an early stage of prosecution. Process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116. Process claims which do not depend from or otherwise include the limitations of the patentable product will be withdrawn from consideration, via an election by original presentation (see MPEP § 821.03). Amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. Process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed product claim and which meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112 may be entered.

Where product and process claims are presented in a single application and that application qualifies under the transitional restriction practice pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b), applicant may either: (A) elect the invention to be searched and examined and pay the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(s) and have the additional inventions searched and examined under 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2); or (B) elect the invention to be searched and examined and not pay the additional fee (37 CFR 1.129(b)(3)). Where no additional fee is paid, if the elected invention is directed to the product and the claims directed to the product are subsequently found patentable, process claims which either depend from or include all the limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined. If applicant chooses to pay the fees to have the additional inventions searched and examined pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2) even if the product is found allowable, applicant would not be entitled to a refund of the fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) by arguing that the process claims could have been rejoined. 37 CFR 1.26(a) states that “[T]he Commissioner may refund any fee paid by mistake or in excess of that required. A change of purpose after the payment of a fee...will not entitle a party to a refund of such fee...” In this case, the fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) were not paid by mistake nor paid in excess, therefore, applicant would not be entitled to a refund. In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action. Form paragraphs 8.42 through 8.44 should be used to notify applicant of the rejoinder of process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowable product claim.

In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 - 1.106. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action.


The following is a recitation from paragraph five, “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. §103(b)” (1184 TMOG 86(March 26, 1996)):

“However, in the case of an elected product claim, rejoinder will be permitted when a product claim is found allowable and the withdrawn process claim **depends from or otherwise includes all the limitations of an allowed product claim**. Withdrawn process claims not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined.”
(emphasis added)


Therefore, in accordance with M.P.EP 821.04 and *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995), rejoinder of product claims with process claims commensurate in scope with the allowed product claims will occur following a finding that the product claims are allowable. Until such time, a restriction between product claims and process claims is deemed proper. Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to maintain either dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. ***Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.***

Response to Restriction

During a telephone conversation with Applicants' representative, Jay P. Lessler, 10 November 2005, an election made ***with*** traverse to ***Group I***, claims



1-80, directed to products of formula (I) , and the specific



compound 30, , depicted in Example 30 page 72 of the specification, is acknowledged.


As previously stated in the restriction requirement, in accordance with M.P.E.P. 821.04 and in re Ochiai, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ (Fed. Cir. 1995), rejoinder of product claims and method of use claims commensurate in scope with the allowed product claims will occur following a finding that the product claims are allowable. Until such time, a restriction between product claims and process is deemed proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-91 are pending in this application. Claims 81-91 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention. The withdrawn subject matter is patentably distinct from the elected subject matter as it differs in structure and element and will require separate search considerations. In addition, a reference, which anticipates one group, would not render obvious the other.

The scope of the invention of the elected subject matter is as follows:



Compounds of formula (I), depicted in claim 1, wherein:

R¹ represents substituted or unsubstituted alkyl;

R² is H;

R³ is H;

R⁴ is -NR⁵R⁶;

R⁵ and **R⁶** represent H, substituted and unsubstituted alkyl, substituted and unsubstituted aryl, substituted and unsubstituted arylalkyl, substituted and unsubstituted heteroaryl, substituted and unsubstituted heterocyclic ring, substituted and unsubstituted heterocyclicalkyl, -C(O)-R^a, -C(O)O-R^a, C(O)NR^aR^a, S(O)q-R^a, S(O)q-NR^aR^a, -C(=S)-NR^aR^a, -C(=S)-NR^a, -N=C(R^aR^a), -NR^aR^a, wherein **R^a** represents H, substituted and unsubstituted alkyl, substituted and unsubstituted heterocyclic ring;

Ar represents substituted and unsubstituted aryl, substituted and unsubstituted heteroaryl ring;

X represents O or S;

P represents O or S;

Y represents -C(O)NR⁷, wherein **R⁷** is H;

m is 0;

n is 1;

q represents 0, 1, or 2;

Claim Objections

Claims 20 are objected to the typo of the chemical name, "...-8-(N,N-dimethylsulphonamide)-...", instead, ...-8-(N,N-dimethylaminosulphonamide)-....

Conclusion

Claims 1-19, 21-80 are allowed.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Chu whose telephone number is 571-272-5759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am - 3:30 pm EST.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1626

Yong Chu, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626

KAMAL A. SAEED, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Joseph M. McKane
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626